Remarks

Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent. Claims 1, 6, 9, and 17 are being amended. Support for these claim amendments can be found at least on page 3, lines 1-11 and page 5, lines 21-29 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants submit no new matter is being introduced by way of this Amendment. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and objections. Reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 were objected due to informalities. In particular, the Office Action on page 2, paragraph 2 appears to indicate proper antecedent basis exists for the phrase "user naming system" and as such should be referred to as "the user naming system." Applicants respectfully disagree. The phrase "user naming system" does not appear prior to the usage in Claims 2 and 3 and as such Applicants refer to the phrase "user naming system" as "a user naming system." Therefore Applicants believe the objections of Claims 2 and 3 are improper and respectfully request the objections be removed.

Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,085,997) hereinafter "Wu", in view of Khakoo et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0135569) hereinafter "Khakoo".

Applicants believe a brief overview of an example embodiment would be helpful. In an example embodiment, an apparatus may comprise a processor on a <u>wireless terminal</u> configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application <u>on the wireless terminal</u>. Applicants believe none of the cited references disclose the feature of a processor on a <u>wireless terminal</u> configured to receive a request for an identity of a user, such as a mobile user, from an application on the <u>wireless terminal</u> as recited in Claim 1 ("...a processor on a <u>wireless terminal</u> configured to receive, from an application <u>on the wireless terminal</u>, a request for an identity of a user...").

Wu discloses an Internet-capable appliance, e.g., a non wireless terminal, for sending a request to a Password-All Portal system, but does not provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. More specifically, Wu discloses a method for a subscribing user operating an Internet-capable appliance. The Internet-capable appliance may gain access to a webpage, via an Internet Service Provider (ISP), which in turn provides access to any one of a number of servers on Internet (Wu, Col. 5, lines 37-44). Thus, Wu merely provides an Internet-capable appliance sending (not receiving) a request to a Password-All Portal to connect to servers, e.g., a wired terminal. Even assuming Wu did teach receiving a request, Wu using a wired terminal does not teach a processor <u>on a wireless terminal</u> configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application <u>on the wireless terminal</u> as claimed in Claim 1.

Khakoo discloses an instant delivery server to update a presence database with user information in a wired network, but does not provide a processor on a wireless application configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application on the wireless application. In particular, Khakoo provides an instant message delivery server, which maintains a presence database. The presence database records information for each user in the community. In use, the instant message delivery server updates the database based on the automatic detection of the presence of the user or by a process of manual registration by the user (Khakoo, paragraph [0021]). In this way, the instant delivery server updates user information on the presence database. Therefore, Khakoo cannot teach receiving a request for an identity of a user let alone provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. Even assuming Khakoo did teach receiving a request, Khakoo using a wired terminal does not teach a processor on a wireless terminal configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application on the wireless terminal as claimed in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Wu and Khakoo either taken separately or in combination do not teach or suggest the claim feature of "a processor on a wireless terminal is configured to receive, from an application the wireless terminal, a request for an identity of a user" as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-4 and 6-8 depend from Claim 1 so they too should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claims 10-12 and 14-16 depend from Claim 9 and Claims 18-20 and 22-24 depend from Claim 18, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Claims 5, 13, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wu, in view of Khakoo, further in view of Gabber et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,961,593) hereinafter "Gabber."

Gabber discloses an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not provide a processor on a wireless terminal configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application on the wireless terminal. In particular, Gabber provides a central proxy system, e.g., a wired terminal, with computer-executable routines. The central proxy system processes site-specific substitute identifiers constructed from data specific to users. The central proxy system transmits the substitute identifiers to the server sites, which re-transmits browsing commands received from the users to the server sites (Gabber, Abstract). In this way, Gabber provides an interface to transmit browsing commands, but does not teach a request for an identify of a user let alone provide a processor configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application. Even assuming Gabber did teach receiving a request, Gabber using a wired terminal does not teach a processor on a wireless terminal configured to receive a request for an identity of a user from an application on the wireless terminal as claimed in Claim 1.

Thus, Gabber does not add the missing claimed feature of "a processor <u>on a wireless terminal</u> configured to receive, from an application<u> on the wireless terminal</u>, a request for an identity of a user" to Wu or Khakoo as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants believe Claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claim 5 depends from Claim 1 so it too should be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Independent Claims 9 and 17 have similar limitations. Since dependent Claim 13 depends from Claim 9 and Claim 21 depends from Claim 17, they too are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Conclusion

        It is clear from the foregoing that the claims are in condition for allowance. An early formal notice of allowance of claims is respectfully requested. Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned with any questions.

        Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment that may be due in this matter to Deposit Account Number 50-0270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas J. Arria/

Thomas J. Arria
Registration No. 60,223

Date: January 28, 2009

NOKIA, INC.
Intellectual Property Rights
ATTN: Docketing
6021 Connection Drive, MS 2-5-520
Irving, Texas 75039

> **Certificate of Service**
>
> I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office via EFS-Web on the date indicated below.
>
> /Denise M. Wilson/
> Signed
>
> January 28, 2009
> Date

10